

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of)	
)	
Space Exploration Holdings, LLC)	File No. SAT-LOA-20161115-00118
)	
Application for Approval for Orbital)	
Deployment and Operating Authority)	
for the SpaceX NGSO Satellite System)	

PETITION TO DENY

In the above-captioned “Application,” Space Exploration Holdings, LLC (“SpaceX”) seeks a license for a planned non-geostationary satellite orbit (“NGSO”) satellite system.¹ Telesat Canada (“Telesat”) files this Petition to Deny for the reasons set out below.

The frequencies proposed by SpaceX for its operations overlap with the following frequency bands Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada (“ISED”) has authorized Telesat to use for its NGSO network: 17.8-18.6 GHz and 18.8-19.3 GHz (space-to-Earth) and 27.5-29.1 GHz and 29.5-30.0 GHz (Earth-to-space).²

SpaceX’s NGSO system would interfere with Telesat’s NGSO operations because the two systems would operate in overlapping geographical areas on overlapping Ka-

¹ See *Public Notice, Applications Accepted For Filing, Cut-Off Established for Additional NGSO-Like Satellite Applications or Petitions For Operations in the 12.75-13.25 GHz, 13.85-14.0 GHz, 18.6-18.8 GHz, 19.3-20.2 GHz, and 29.1-29.5 GHz Bands*, DA 17-524, File No. SAT-LOI-20161115-00121 (May 26, 2017).

² Telesat Approvals in Principle, ISED file 3150-1 (557203 AT) dated June 26, 2015, and ISED file 3150-1 (565832 SS) dated June 26, 2015, for the 27.5 – 29.1, 29.5 – 30, 17.8 – 19.3, and 19.7 – 20.2 GHz bands.

band frequencies. Because SpaceX's NGSO system would interfere with Telesat's NGSO operations, Telesat hereby opposes SpaceX's Application.³

SpaceX acknowledges the potential for in-line interference events with other NGSO operators, but asserts that it has "engineered its system with the technical flexibility that will facilitate the other NGSO satellite systems, and is committed to achieving mutually satisfactory agreements."⁴ As to what the result would be if such coordination agreements cannot be reached, SpaceX appears to rely upon the Commission's default procedures, now under review by the Commission in its rulemaking, under which, absent coordination agreements, NGSO operators would be required to divide their spectrum equally during in-line interference events.⁵ Such events would be deemed to exist, regardless of the actual interference being suffered, based upon a fixed ten degree avoidance angle.⁶

³Telesat is filing this Petition to Deny or Impose Conditions to preserve its rights. Telesat recognizes that the Commission is still developing rules to address constellations of NGSO-like satellites and has stated that applicants will be given an opportunity to amend their filings to conform to the new requirements. *Update to Parts 2 and 25 Concerning Non-Geostationary, Fixed-Satellite Service Systems and Related Matters*, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 31 FCC Rcd 13651 (2016) ("NGSO NPRM"). Telesat also recognizes that if SpaceX's Application is granted before the Commission's rulemaking is completed, the Application likely will be conditioned on the outcome of the rulemaking, as was done with OneWeb's application. *See WorldVu Satellites Limited, Petition for a Declaratory Ruling Granting Access to the U.S. Market for the OneWeb NGSO FSS System*, IBFS File No. SAT-LOI-20160428-00041 (rel. June 23, 2017) ("OneWeb Grant"), at ¶¶ 12 and 26. If the rules the Commission adopts or a future SpaceX amendment resolve Telesat's interference concerns, it will withdraw its objection.

⁴ SpaceX Application, Attachment A, Technical Information to Supplement Schedule S ("SpaceX Technical Supplement"), at 42.

⁵ See 47 C.F.R. § 25.261(c).

⁶ *Id.*

As demonstrated by Telesat in its filings in connection with the Commission's pending *NGSO NPRM*, however, these mechanisms are unworkable.⁷ No single avoidance angle will address in-line interference events. For any specific interference level, there will be a wide variety of angles that vary based on the ever-changing relative positions of satellites and ground terminals. Relying on these default procedures, therefore, would expose Telesat's operations to harmful interference.

SpaceX's Application, while mentioning matters of ITU priority as between GSO and NGSO systems,⁸ does not address the operation of ITU priority as between NGSO systems. Of particular concern to Telesat, SpaceX offers no recognition that the Canadian ITU filings that are associated with Telesat's NGSO system have date priority over later ITU filings that may be associated with SpaceX's system.⁹

In granting OneWeb's NGSO application, the Commission recognized that "[c]ompliance with ITU coordination procedures is a requirement of the ITU Radio Regulations, which hold the force of treaty to which the United States is a party," and that "[s]uch compliance is a typical condition of both U.S. space station licenses and grants of U.S. market access."¹⁰ Based on this requirement, and in response to concerns raised by Telesat, the Commission conditioned the grant of OneWeb's NGSO

⁷ See *Comments of Telesat Canada, NGSO NPRM*, at 6-15 (Feb. 27, 2017); *Reply Comments of Telesat Canada, NGSO NPRM*, at 4-12.

⁸ See SpaceX Technical Supplement at 42.

⁹ See COMMSTELLATION network published as CR/C/3313 and CR/C/3313 MOD-2, and CANPOL-2 network published as CR/C/3474 MOD-1. SpaceX states that "will operate under network filings made on its behalf with the ITU administrations of the U.S. (under the satellite network name USASAT NGSO-3) and Norway (under the satellite network name STEAM)." SpaceX Technical Supplement, at 49.

¹⁰ *OneWeb Grant*, n. 35.

application on compliance with ITU requirements.¹¹ The same considerations apply here, and so the same condition should apply to any grant of SpaceX's Application.

In view of the potential for SpaceX's system to interfere with Telesat's NGSO operations, SpaceX's Application should not be granted in its present form. At a minimum, any grant should be conditioned on the outcome of the NGSO rulemaking, as the Commission did in granting OneWeb's NGSO application.¹² Finally, in recognition of U.S. treaty obligations, any grant should be conditioned on compliance with ITU requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

TELESAT CANADA

/s/
Elisabeth Neasmith
Director, Spectrum Management and Development
1601 Telesat Court
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada, K1B 5P4
(613) 748-0123

June 26, 2017

¹¹ *OneWeb Grant*, ¶ 23(a).

¹² *OneWeb Grant*, ¶¶ 12 and 26.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 26th day of June, 2017, a copy of the foregoing Petition to Deny was sent by electronic mail to the following:

William M. Wiltshire
WWiltshire@hwglaw.com

/s/
Katia Carty